



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,004	12/01/2003	Gerd Danner	34874-082 UTIL	5231

64280 7590 05/01/2007  
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C.  
9255 TOWNE CENTER DRIVE  
SUITE 600  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

EXAMINER
----------

CHEN, TE Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2161

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/01/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/726,004

Applicant(s)

DANNER ET AL.

Examiner

Susan Y. Chen

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/21/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Response to Amendment***

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on Feb. 21, 2007 has been entered.

This office action is in response to the amendment filed on Feb. 21, 2007.

Claims 1-23, are pending for examination, claims 1 and 15 have been amended, claims 21-23 have been newly added.

***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

At section 0065, there is a typing error, the "date abstraction layer 106" should be changed to "data abstraction layer 106".

Applicant is reminded to thoroughly check the whole specification to remove all possible semantic errors as needed.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-14, 21 and 23, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As to claim 1, the claimed subject matter "if a report requests data or services from the data sources of the first data set...the data is processed by the BI platform" is new, because it is not supported by the instant specification.

As to claim 2-14, these claims have the same defects as their base claims, hence, are rejected for the same reason.

As to claim 21, the claimed subject matter "the unified view module does not include information identifying sources of data in the common meta model data set such that the mapping of the data is not visible to a user of the common meta model data set" is new, because it is not supported by the instant specification.

Art Unit: 2161

As to claim 23, the claimed subject matter "the common meta model defining a model of data being source and integration path independent" is new, because it is not supported by the instant specification.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claim 22, applicant's fails to define the metes and bounds of the claimed "first and second integration paths", "the first service quality" and "the second service quality", thereby, they render the claim to be indefinite.

Because the ambiguous nature of instant invention, the newly added claims 21-23 will have no art rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-23, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. US 2003/0208460 issued to Srikant et al. (hereinafter referred as Srikant) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,604,110 issued to Savage et al. (hereinafter referred as Savage).

Claims 1-20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Claim 1:

Srikant discloses a system for operational reporting of multidimensional analysis of business data sources [e.g., the Online Analytical Processing (OLAP) application at P. 1, Sections: 0003-0010, the Distributed Teradata Warehouse & Teradata Customer Analysis product at section 0035], the system comprising:

one or more data sources providing OLTP data [e.g., the data warehouse at Section 0004, the source metadata and the OLAP data store at P. 1, Sections: 0009, the Distributed Teradata Warehouse, 0034-0035, the units: 420, 434 at Fig. 4 and associated texts];

a business intelligence (BI) platform having a multidimensional database providing OLAP data [e.g., P. 1, Sections: 0003-0005, 0050-0052 & Fig. 4]; and

a mapping tool to transform the OLTP data of the data sources not being processed by an OLTP engine or the BI platform to a first data set in accordance with a common meta model of a unified view module [e.g., Sections: 0058 –0060, Fig. 6 and associated texts];

the unified view module integrate the first data set of the OLTP data with the multidimensional database to produce a common meta model data set [e.g., Fig. 8 and associated texts]; and

a user interface (UI) tool set for creating a unified UI for displaying reports that are run on the multidimensional database and common meta model data set, the unified UI build reports from the common meta model data set e.g., the Graphical User Interface (GUI) at P. 3, Sections: 0031-0034],

Srikant did not specifically disclosed that if a report request data or services from the data sources of the first data set, an OLAP engine does not process the OLTP data and if the report requests data or services from the BI platform, the data is processed by the BI platform [e.g., Sections: 00032-0034]:

However, Savage discloses the claimed features [e.g., Abstract, col. 2, lines 49-col. 3, lines 34, Fig(s). 2-4 and associated texts].

Srikant and Savage are both of the same endeavor to facilitate the OLAP analysis of data source in an Enterprise data Management (EDM) system by using metadata characteristics of a generic Model, hence, with the teachings of Srikant and Savage in front of him/her, it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled person in the art at the time the invention was made being motivated to apply the automatically configuring generic metadata repository technique as disclosed by Savage into Srikant's system, because by doing so, as suggested by Savage, the combined system would provide a generic metadata repository which can be configured to reflect the construct of any given data source ( Note, this including the claimed BI platform). Once

Art Unit: 2161

configured, the source database can be automatically analyzed in an elemental sequence defined by the repository's entity structure which result in the set of metadata can be used directly to generate program code for a plurality of different EDM applications each with different database models and operating systems as desired by the various business applications [e.g., Savage: col. 2, lines 20-45].

Claim 2:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 1, the combined system of Srikant and Savage further discloses the system comprising a UI runtime module to display the unified UI [e.g., Srikant: P. 3, Sections: 0035-0036].

Claim 3:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 1, the combined system of Srikant and Savage further discloses the system comprising a data acquisition module to acquire the OLTP data from the OLTP data source, and to provide the OLTP data to the multidimensional database or to the unified view module [e.g., P.3, Sections: 0031, 0036-37].

Claim 4:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 1, the combined system of Srikant and Savage further discloses the BI platform is to execute OLAP analysis on the multidimensional database [e.g., P. 2, Section: 0015-0016 & Fig. 7].



Claim 5:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 4, the combined system of Srikant and Savage further discloses the BI platform further includes a communication channel connected to a remote OLAP data source [e.g., the Internet at P. 6, Sections: 0062-0064].

Claim 6:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 3, the combined system of Srikant and Savage further discloses the data acquisition module further includes one or more resource adapters for connecting to the one or more data sources [e.g., Fig. 7 & P. 6, Sections: 0062-0064].

Claim 7:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 3, the combined system of Srikant and Savage further discloses the data acquisition module further includes one or more extraction programs to read data from the one or more data sources [e.g., the extract/link/load software of OLAP at P. 1, Section: 0005 & Fig. 8].

Claim 8:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 3, the combined system of Srikant and Savage further discloses the data acquisition module further includes an exchange

infrastructure for message-based exchange between the one or more data sources and the BI platform [e.g., the Teradata Customer Analysis Product at P. 3, Section: 0035].

Claim 9:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 1, the combined system of Srikant and Savage further discloses the system comprising a mapping tool for mapping a data model of the one or more data sources to a common meta model for use by the unified view module [e.g., P. 5, Section: 0059].

Claim 10:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 9, the combined system of Srikant and Savage further discloses the mapping is automatic [e.g., P. 2, Section: 0012].

Claim 11:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 9, the combined system of Srikant and Savage further discloses the mapping is manual [e.g., P. 6, Section: 0071].

Claim 12:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 4, the combined system of Srikant and Savage further discloses the BI platform further comprises a persistency memory for storing one or more tables representing the OLAP analysis [e.g., the unit 312, Fig. 3].

Claim 13:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 1, the combined system of Srikant and Savage further discloses the unified UI is generated by a web application [e.g., the Web GUI at P.3, Section: 0035 & P. 6, Section: 0064].

Claim 14:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 1, the combined system of Srikant and Savage further discloses the unified UI is generated by a desktop application [e.g., the Web GUI at P. 6, Section: 0064].

Claim 15:

Srikant discloses an architecture for integrating online transactional processing (OLTP) systems with online analytical processing (OLAP) system [e.g., Srikant: the Online Analytical Processing (OLAP) application at P. 1, Sections: 0003-0010, Distributed Teradata Warehouse & Teradata Customer Analysis product at section 0035], the architecture comprising:

a data access layer including one or more data access programs for accessing OLTP data from an OLTP data source [e.g., Srikant: Fig. 3];

a service layer including a business intelligence (BI) platform for generating OLAP data, and a mapping tool for transforming data from the OLTP data source to a

Art Unit: 2161

first data set in accordance with a common meta-model [e.g., Srikant: P. 1, Sections: 0003-0005, 0050-0052, 0058 –0060 & Fig(s). 4 - 6 and associated texts];

a unified view module providing the common meta-model for OLTP data of the first data set integrated with OLAP data [e.g., Srikant: Fig. 8 and associated texts]; and

a user interface presentation layer configured to provide a user interface for displaying a report run on the integrated OLTP and OLAP data [e.g., Srikant: the Graphical User Interface (GUI) at P. 3, Sections: 0031-0034].

Srikant did not specifically disclosed that mapping tool for transforming data from the OLTP data source to a first data set is without processing the OLTP data by an OLAP engine or the BI platform.

However, Savage discloses the claimed features [e.g., Abstract, col. 2, lines 49- col. 3, lines 34, Fig(s). 2-4 and associated texts].

Srikant and Savage are both of the same endeavor to facilitate the OLAP analysis of data source in an Enterprise data Management (EDM) system by using metadata characteristics of a generic Model, hence, with the teachings of Srikant and Savage in front of him/her, it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled person in the art at the time the invention was made being motivated to apply the automatically configuring generic metadata repository technique as disclosed by Savage into Srikant's system, because by doing so, as suggested by Savage, the combined system would provide a generic metadata repository which can be configured to reflect the construct of any given data source ( Note, this including the claimed BI platform). Once configured, the source database can be automatically analyzed in an elemental

Art Unit: 2161

sequence defined by the repository's entity structure which result in the set of metadata can be used directly to generate program code for a plurality of different EDM applications each with different database models and operating systems as desired by the various business applications [e.g., Savage: col. 2, lines 20-45].

Claim 16:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 15, the combined system of Srikant and Savage further discloses the common meta-model is organized into a unified business query view for display in the user interface [e.g., Srikant: Fig. 2].

Claim 17:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 15, the combined system of Srikant and Savage further discloses the user interface presentation layer includes a design time module for generating the user interface [e.g., Srikant: P. 3, Section: 0031].

Claim 18:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 17, the combined system of Srikant and Savage further discloses the user interface presentation layer includes a runtime module having an application for displaying the user interface [e.g., Srikant: P. 3, Section: 0035].

Claim 19:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 18, the combined system of Srikant and Savage further discloses the application is a web application [e.g., Srikant: P. 3, Section: 0035].

Claim 20:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 18, the combined system of Srikant and Savage further discloses the application is a desktop application [e.g., Srikant: P. 3, Section: 0035].

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to the amended claims 1-23, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

To expedite the process of re-examination, the examiner requests that all future correspondences in regard to overcoming prior art rejections or other issues (e.g. 35 U.S.C. 112) set forth by the Examiner prior to the office action, that applicant should provide and link to the most specific page and line numbers of the disclosure where best support is found (see 35 U.S.C. 132).

Art Unit: 2161

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Y. Chen whose telephone number is 571-272-4016. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mofiz Apu can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Susan Y Chen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2161



April 25, 2007